

deployed without an “exit strategy”. Not only do we have no apparent exit strategy, we also have no apparent entry strategy: the President recently admitted that Iraq had nothing to do with September 11th; no weapons of mass destruction have been located; Iraq was never an imminent threat to the United States. We cannot develop an exit strategy, if we cannot articulate what the entry strategy was. A yes vote on the bill forfeits a Congressional opportunity to require the administration to clearly establish an exit strategy.

Notwithstanding all of the reasons to vote “no”, if the passage of the bill would result in a safer America, it would be worth the cost. Unfortunately, even before the war, the CIA concluded that Iraq posed very little threat to the United States at the time, but would pose an increased threat if we attacked them. A letter from CIA Director George Tenet to the Chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, dated October 7, 2002, and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD stated that: “Baghdad for now appears to be drawing a line short of conducting terrorist attacks with conventional or CBW (chemical and biological weapons) against the United States. Should Saddam conclude that a United States-led attack could no longer be deterred, he would probably become much less constrained in adopting terrorist actions.” Certainly we cannot be any safer than the CIA said we were before we attacked; but, most recent reports describe more terrorists now gathering in Iraq than before the war. So, the policy which includes the expenditure of \$166 billion and the loss of many courageous lives has failed to make us safer.

Because the appropriations in the bill represent more than the United States last year for the United States Department of Homeland Security, the U.S. Department of Transportation, the U.S. Department of Education, the U.S. Department of Labor, and the U.S. Department of State; because there is no plan for paying the bill; because failed policies will be validated by the passage of the bill; and because we are in fact more at risk, not safer as result of those policies, I urge my colleagues to oppose the bill.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this request for nearly \$87 billion to continue the occupation and rebuilding of Iraq and Afghanistan. This is money we do not have for a foreign welfare program. The burden on our already weakened economy could well be crippling.

Those who argue that we must vote for this appropriation because “we must succeed” in Iraq are misguided. Those who say this, have yet to define what it means—in concrete terms—to have “success” in Iraq. What is success in Iraq? How will we achieve success in Iraq? How will we know when we have succeeded in Iraq? About how long will “success” take to achieve and about how much will it cost? These are reasonable questions to have when we are asked to spend billions of taxpayers’ dollars, but thus far we have heard little more than nice-sounding platitudes.

We have established a troubling precedent that no matter how ill-conceived an intervention, we must continue to become more deeply involved because “we must succeed.” That is one reason we see unrelated funding in this supplemental for places like Liberia and Sudan.

Mr. Chairman this reconstruction of Iraq—that we are making but a down-payment on

today—is at its core just another foreign policy boondoggle. The \$20 billion plan to “rebuild” Iraq tilts heavily toward creating a statist economy and is filled with very liberal social-engineering programs. Much of the money in this reconstruction plan will be wasted—as foreign aid most often is. Much will be wasted as corporate welfare to politically-connected corporations; much will be thrown away at all the various “non-government organizations” that aim to teach the Iraqis everything from the latest American political correctness to the “right” way to vote. The bill includes \$900 million to import petroleum products into Iraq (a country with the second largest oil reserves in the world); \$793 million for healthcare in Iraq when we’re in the midst of our own crisis and about to raise Medicare premiums of our seniors; \$10 million for “women’s leadership programs” (more social engineering); \$200 million in loan guarantees to Pakistan (a military dictatorship that likely is the home of Osama bin Laden); \$245 million for the “U.S. share” of U.N. peacekeeping in Liberia and Sudan; \$95 million for education in Afghanistan; \$600 million for repair and modernization of roads and bridges in Iraq (while our own infrastructure crumbles).

There has been some discontent among conservatives about the \$20 billion reconstruction price tag. They fail to realize that this is just the other side of the coin of military interventionism. It is the same coin, which is why I have consistently opposed foreign interventionism. There is a lesson here that those who call themselves fiscal conservatives seem to not have learned. There is no separation between the military intervention and the post-military intervention, otherwise known as “nation-building.” Fiscal conservatives are uneasy about nation-building and foreign aid. The president himself swore off nation-building as a candidate. But anyone concerned about sending American tax dollars to foreign countries must look directly at military interventionism abroad. If there is one thing the history of our interventionism teaches, it is that the best way for a foreign country to become a financial dependent of the United States is to first be attacked by the United States.

This request—which was not the first and will not be the last—demonstrates in the most concrete terms that there is a real and concrete cost of our policy of interventionism. The American taxpayer paid to bomb Baghdad and now will pay to rebuild Iraq—its schools, hospitals, prisons, roads, and more. Many Americans cannot afford to send their own children to college, but with the money in this bill they will be sending Iraqi kids to college. Is this really what the American people want?

The real point is that the billions we are told we must spend to rebuild Iraq is indeed the natural outcome of our policy of pre-emptive military intervention. All those who voted for the resolution authorizing the president to attack Iraq have really already voted for this supplemental. There is no military intervention without a “Marshall Plan” afterward, regardless of our ability to pay. And the American people will be expected to pay for far more. This current request is only perhaps step four in what will likely be a 10 or more step program to remake Iraq and the rest of the Middle East in the image of Washington, D.C. social engineers and “global planners.” What will be steps five, six, seven, eight? Long-term occupation, micro-managing Iraq’s economy, or-

ganizing and managing elections, writing an Iraqi constitution. And so on. When will it end?

There is also much said about how we must support this supplemental because to do otherwise would mean not supporting the troops. I resent this dishonest accusation. It is nothing but a red herring. I wonder if an American currently serving an open-ended occupation in Iraq would think that bringing him home next week would be a good show of support for our troops. Maintaining an increasingly deadly occupation of Iraq and bankrupting many of our reservists and national guard troops by unilaterally extending their contracts to serve in an active deployment is hardly “supporting the troops.” Perhaps that is why a Stars and Stripes newspaper survey of the troops in Iraq this week found that a majority had very low morale. And according to the same Stars and Stripes survey, an increasing number are not planning to re-enlist.

Conservatives often proclaim that they are opposed to providing American welfare to the rest of the world. I agree. The only way to do that, however, is to stop supporting a policy of military interventionism. You cannot have one without the other. If a military intervention against Syria and Iran are next, it will be the same thing: we will pay to bomb the country and we will pay even more to rebuild it—and as we see with the plan for Iraq, this rebuilding will not be done on the cheap. The key fallacy in the argument of the militarists is that there is some way to fight a war without associated costs—the costs of occupation, reconstruction, “institution-building,” “democracy programs.”

I opposed our action against Iraq for two main reasons. I sincerely believed that our national security was not threatened and I did not believe that Saddam Hussein’s regime was involved in the attack on the United States on 9/11. I believe what we have learned since the intervention has supported my view. Meanwhile, while our troops are trying to police the border between Syria and Iraq our own borders remain as porous as ever. Terrorists who entered our country could easily do so again through our largely unpatrolled borders. While we expend American blood and treasure occupying a country that was not involved in the attack on the U.S., those were responsible for the attack most likely are hiding out in Pakistan—a military dictatorship we are now allied with and to which this supplemental sends some \$200 million in loan guarantees.

Our continued occupation of Iraq is not producing the promised results, despite efforts paint a brighter picture of the current situation. What once was a secular dictatorship appears to be moving toward being a fundamentalist Islamic regime—not the democracy we were promised. As repulsive as Saddam’s regime was, the prospect of an Iraq run by Islamic clerics, aligned with Iranian radicals and hostile to the United States, is no more palatable. There are signs that this is the trend. The press reports regularly on attacks against Iraq’s one million Christians. Those hand-picked by the United States to run Iraq have found themselves targets for assassination. Clerics are forming their own militias. The thousands of non-combatants killed in the U.S. intervention are seeking revenge against the unwanted American occupiers.

Mr. Chairman, throwing billions of dollars after a failed policy will not produce favorable

results. We are heading full-speed toward bankruptcy, yet we continue to spend like there is no tomorrow. There will be a tomorrow, however. The money we are spending today is real. The bill will be paid, whether through raising taxes or printing more money. Either way, the American people will become poorer in pursuit of a policy that cannot and will not work. We cannot re-make the world in our own image. The stated aim was to remove Saddam Hussein. That mission is accomplished. The best policy now for Iraq is to declare victory and bring our troops home. We should let the people of Iraq rebuild their own country. I urge my colleagues to vote against this supplemental request.

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Chairman, first and foremost, I want to say that I fully support our troops. I am so proud of the job they are doing in Iraq and Afghanistan. They are sacrificing greatly overseas so we don't have to fight the war on terror here on our shores. To bring this conflict to a successful conclusion, \$65.2 billion of this supplemental request is essential to help provide every resource our men and women need.

That being said, I work for the people of the 9th District of North Carolina and they cannot understand why the remaining \$21.6 billion of the Iraq Supplemental may not be given in the form of a loan. Iraq contains the second largest oil reserve in the world and will have an astonishing \$5 billion surplus at the end of this year—all this, while we have record deficits in our own country. For decades to come, America's children will be paying for this reconstruction grant on behalf of the Iraqi children. That is unconscionable! Again, that country has the great wealth of oil. They can pay us back.

The majority of this bill will provide for our troops and that is good. It was my strong desire to have the opportunity to debate and vote on the defense money and the Iraq reconstruction money of this supplemental in separate bills. However, we don't have clean bills in this House; so we don't have that opportunity.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Chairman, I will vote for the legislation to approve the administration's request for \$87 billion in additional funding for operations in Iraq. We must provide our men and women in uniform in Iraq with the resources they need to complete their mission, as safely and securely as possible. They have performed brilliantly—protecting civilians, maintaining order and promoting democracy while facing the threat of attacks each and every day. We are proud of them and we need to continue supporting them. I will vote to provide whatever resources our troops need to complete their mission.

Unfortunately, the administration and leadership have brought this request before us under a process which forces us to approve \$20 billion in spending for an ill-advised plan for Iraq reconstruction. Many of the items in the reconstruction are more appropriately the responsibility of the Iraqi provisional government or have extremely inflated costs. I commend the work of Chairman YOUNG, Ranking Member OBEY and the rest of the Appropriations Committee to scrub the administration's request and remove many questionable or low-priority items.

Even with these improvements, many questions remain about how these funds will be used. Our constituents deserve to know that their tax dollars are being used in the most effec-

tive manner possible. The missteps of the past must not be compounded by wasteful spending now. The President must be willing to report to Congress—and the American people—on how the money is spent. That is what this amendment would require. A detailed accounting is needed.

The American people also deserve to know what our plan is for successfully completing our mission in Iraq to improve the security and political situation and reducing our presence. While the battle to oust Saddam Hussein was well-planned and well-executed, we did not plan well for winning the peace and rebuilding the nation of Iraq. Our troops have been taking almost all the risks, and American taxpayers have been paying all the bills.

Our "go-it-alone" strategy must end. This amendment will require the President to present a detailed plan for improving the situation in postwar Iraq and report on our progress in achieving the goals of improving the political and security conditions in Iraq.

Congress and the American public need to know the impact our operations in Iraq will have on a federal budget that is nearly a half trillion dollars in deficit already. It is now abundantly clear that the costs of operations in Iraq will be much greater than was anticipated when the budget was approved just six months ago. Already, we have spent \$63 billion in Iraq this year, and we are being asked to provide an additional \$87 billion in this bill.

That would bring the total spending on operations in Iraq to \$150 billion in the year 2003—a staggering figure for one year—with more to come. There is no question that we will be in Iraq for a long time, at great expense to the American taxpayers.

We have a responsibility to reevaluate our budgetary priorities to reflect that reality so that these additional expenses are not simply added to the national debt. It would be irresponsible to completely ignore those costs. We need to budget honestly for the costs of continued operations in Iraq so that Congress can consider the tradeoffs necessary to provide the needed funding without adding to the national debt. Paying for our operations in Iraq will require sacrifices. It would be extremely irresponsible for us to refuse to make any sacrifices ourselves and expect our troops to also pay the financial debts once they return home. The cause of freedom and justice is great, but it demands great commitment and sacrifice by all of us who enjoy its benefits, not simply by the men and women in uniform.

Like all of my colleagues, I pray for the successful completion of our mission in Iraq and the safe return of our men and women in uniform. This amendment will help ensure that we have a plan to accomplish this goal as quickly as possible.

There being no further amendments in order, pursuant to House Resolution 396, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington) having assumed the chair, Mr. LATOURETTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3289) making emergency supplemental appropriations for defense and for the reconstruction of Iraq and Afghanistan for the fiscal year ending September 30,

2004, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 396, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MS. KILPATRICK

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Ms. KILPATRICK. Yes, in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. KILPATRICK of Michigan moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 3289, to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

Page 51, after line 11, insert the following new section:

SEC. 3007. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available in this Act under the heading "IRAQ RELIEF AND RECONSTRUCTION FUND" may be provided in a form other than loans.

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply with respect to the obligation of the initial 50 percent of the funds referred to in such subsection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion to recommit.

□ 1400

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recommit the bill and ask that the Members please look at this closely. Here we have an amendment before you to recommit that would require that 50 percent of the funding for reconstruction be given in a loan, and we have had much discussion over that, although we did not finish the discussion. Because Iraq has at least \$2 trillion of oil reserves in the ground it is anticipated that they will be able to cultivate over the next year, because Iraq will have the wherewithal over the next 5 years to repay much of their debt, the question before us is should we require 50 percent of our reconstruction funds be repaid back?

It is very disturbing to this Member that we are worried about Iraq's debt and not worried about our grandchildren's debt. This is a very straightforward amendment that would ask that 50 percent of our reconstruction dollars be in the form of a loan to Iraq. We have talked about it quite a bit, and it is because the long-term tax burden will be great on our own United